



ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ రాజ పత్రము
THE ANDHRA PRADESH GAZETTE
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

PART II EXTRAORDINARY

No.118

AMARAVATI, MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2019

G.240

NOTIFICATIONS BY HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, Etc.

--X--

**CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF STATE TAXES,
ANDHRA PRADESH, VIJAYAWADA.**

CCT's File No: REV03-24022(31)/2/2019 - DXZ SEC-CCT Dated: 28-05-2019.

COMMERCIAL TAXES DEPARTMENT - ZONE -I - VISAKHAPATNAM NODAL DIVISION -
ALLOTMENT OF DR ACTOS UNDER 10/1999 NOTIFICATION - CERTAIN ACTOS
NOT PASSED THE DEPARTMENTAL TESTS WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED TIME -
PROBATION PERIOD EXTENDED - GOVERNMENT RELAXED RULE 16 (h) OF
AP STATE AND SUBORDINATE SERVICE RULES - REVISION OF DATE OF
REGULARIZATION AND DECLARATION OF PROBATION - ORDERS ISSUED -
REQUEST - RESTORING ORIGINAL PLACAELEMENT IN THE SENIORITY LIST-
CONSIDERED - ISSUANCE OF SHOW CAUSE NOTICE - OBJECTIONS CALLED
FOR- OBJECTIONS RECEIVED.

- Ref:-
1. CCT's Ref.No:DX4/77/2001, dt: 22.01.2001.
 2. Deputy Commissioner (CT), Visakhapatnam vide proceedings No: A7/85/2001, dt: 03.02.2001.
 3. Additional Commissioner (CT), O/o CCT, A.P., Proceedings No: DX2/390/2011, Zone -I, dt: 03.10.2012.
 4. G.O. Rt.No: 5, Revenue (CT-I) Dept, dt: 01.01.2019.
 5. Joint Commissioner (ST), Visakhapatnam vide Proceedings No: 532/2015/A7,dt: 13.02.2019.
 6. Representations of Sri D.Rambabu, Sri P.Narayana Sastry, Sri P.Venu Gopala Rao, DCTOs of Zone-I, dt: 18.02.2019.

7. CCT's File.No. REV03-24022(31)/2/2019- DXZ SEC- CCT, dt. 29.03.2019.
8. A.P.Gazette No. 56, dt. 16.04.2019.
9. CCT's File.No. REV03-24022(31)/2/2019- DXZ SEC- CCT, dt. 18.04.2019.

1. In the reference 1st cited 13 DR ACTOs who are selected vide 10/1999 notification in the year 2001 were allotted to Visakhapatnam Nodal Division. In the reference 2nd cited the Deputy Commissioner (CT), Visakhapatnam appointed them as ACTOs.
2. (1) Sri D.Ram Babu, presently DCTO, Anakapalli, (2) Sri P.Narayana Sastry, presently DCTO, O/o JC (ST), Vizianagaram (3) Sri P.Venu Gopala Rao, presently DCTO, O/o AC (ST), Vizianagaram, (4) Smt B.Sakuntala, presently DCTO O/o AC (ST), Surya Bagh Circle, Visakhapatnam and (5) Sri V.Appala Naidu, presently DCTO, O/o AC (ST), Dwaraka Nagar Circle have not passed the departmental tests within the prescribed time. Hence, their probation was declared on 20.11.2004, 23.01.2006, 24.11.2004, 11.09.2006 and 11.09.2006 respectively.
3. In the reference 3rd cited the Additional Commissioner (CT), O/o CCT, A.P., finalized the seniority list of ACTOs for the years 2000-01 to 2004-05. In that list Sri D.Rambabu, presently DCTO, Anakapalli, Visakhapatnam Division at Sl.No.21, Sri V.Appala Naidu, DCTO, Dwarakanagar Circle, Visakhapatnam at Sl.No.40, Smt B.Sakuntala presently DCTO, Suryabagh Circle, Visakhapatnam Division at Sl.No.41, P.Narayana Sastry, presently DCTO(Revisions), Vizianagaram Division at Sl.No.24 and Sri P.Venu Gopala Rao presently DCTO, O/o CTO, Vizianagaram West, Vizianagaram Division at Sl.No. 22.
4. In the reference 4th cited the Government relax rule 16(h) of AP State and Sub-ordinate Service Rules, 1996 in respect of 11 ACTOs of 2001 batch (presently DCTOs) for regularization of their services by declaring the commencement of probation with effect from their date of joining as ACTOs, as a special case, in exercise of the powers conferred under Rule 31 of AP State and Sub-ordinate Service Rules, 1996.
5. Basing on the above Government orders, in the reference 5th cited the Joint Commissioner (ST), Visakhapatnam declared probation to the following officers as detailed below:

Sl.No	Name of the Individual	Date of Joining as ACTO	Date of regularization of services in the cadre of ACTO	Date of completion of 2 years duty period	Date of declaration of probation
1	Sri D.Rambabu the then ACTO and presently working as DCTO (re-designated as Deputy Assistant Commissioner (ST), O/o AC (ST), Anakapalli Circle, Visakhapatnam	03.02.2001	03.02.2001	15.09.2003 (availed 224 days EOL)	15.09.2003
2	Sri P.Narayana Sastry the then ACTO and presently working as DCTO (re-designated as Deputy Assistant Commissioner (ST), O/o JC (ST), Vizianagaram	06.02.2001	06.02.2001	22.02.2003 (availed 17 days leave)	22.02.2003
3	Sri P.Venugopala Rao the then ACTO and presently working as DCTO (re-designated as Deputy Assistant Commissioner (ST), O/o AC (ST), Vizianagaram	09.02.2001	09.02.2001	08.02.2003	08.02.2003
4	Smt B.Sakuntala the then ACTO and presently working as DCTO (re-designated as Deputy Assistant Commissioner (ST), O/o AC (ST), S.B.Circle, Visakhapatnam	12.02.2001	12.02.2001	17.07.2003 (availed 156 days leave)	17.07.2003
5	Sri V.Appala Naidu the then ACTO and presently working as DCTO (re-designated as Deputy Assistant Commissioner (ST), O/o AC (ST), Dwarakanagar, Visakhapatnam	07.02.2001	07.02.2001	06.02.2003	06.02.2003

6. In the reference 6th cited, Sri D.Rambabu, Sri P.Narayana Sastry, Sri P.Venu Gopala Rao, DCTOs of Zone-I requested for restoring their original placement consequent on the orders issued by Joint Commissioner (ST), Visakhapatnam vide Proceedings No: 532/2015/A7, dt: 13.02.2019.
7. In the reference 7th cited Show Cause Notice was issued calling objections from the effected persons on proposed placing of Sri D.Rambabu, presently DCTO, Anakapalli, Visakhapatnam Division at Sl.No.6, Sri V.Appala Naidu, DCTO, Dwarakanagar Circle, Visakhapatnam at Sl.No.7, Smt D.Sakuntala presently DCTO, Suryabagh Circle, Visakhapatnam Division at Sl.No.9, P.Narayana Sastry, presently DCTO(Revisions), Vizianagaram Division at Sl.No.10 and Sri P.Venu Gopala Rao presently DCTO, O/o CTO, Vizianagaram West, Vizianagaram Division at Sl.No. 15 in the seniority list of ACTOs of Zone -I. The Show Cause Notice was published in the AP Gazette vide Gazette No. 56, dt. 16.04.2019. Further vide this office ref. No. CCT's File.No. REV03-24022(31)/2/2019- DXZ SEC-CCT, dt. 18.04.2019 errata was issued regarding deletion of panel years against the above individuals.

In response to the above Show Cause Notice the following individuals filed their objections as follows:

- I. Objections filed by Sri S.Tharakaramarao, Deputy Commercial Tax Officer O/o R.V & E.O, Srikakulam, Sri U. Srinivasulu, DCTO, O/o CTO, Dabagardens, Visakhapatnam Division and Smt. Gaja Lakshmi, DCTO, O/o CTO, Steel Plant, Visakhapatnam (filed same objections except objection number 3 below):
 - (1) Issuance of G.O. by altering the date of commencement of Probation is contradiction to the Rule 31 of APSSS Rules 1996:
 - The Government vide G.O.Rt.No. 5, dt. 01.01.2019 was relaxed Rule 16(h) and declared the commencement of probation w.e.f. their date of joining as ACTO by exercising the powers conferred U/R 31 of APSSS Rule 1996 on the unreasonable ground that "In order to maintain uniformity among the same batch" is highly objectionable and not in accordance with the policy adopted by the Government of Andhra Pradesh.
 - The power of relaxation of Rules as enumerated U/R 31 has to be exercise by the Government with the due care in light of the larger public interest or the application of such rules in likely to cause under hardship to such persons affected. Whereas in the present case

each of the person (except few) was knowingly and willingly went for preparation of Civil Services / Group - I exams and other personal grounds and proceeded on EOL and other leaves for which only their commencement of probation has got extended in accordance with the rules as stipulated. Hence, in absence of Public Interest and undue hardship by applying the rules as stipulated in the Rule 31 of APSSS Rules, the issuance of the said G.O. is irregular and illegal and liable to withdrawn accordingly.

- In this regard, it is pertinent to note that, according to the GO Ms No.509 GAD (APTI) dt.31-12-1999 the Government has took a stand that “ The General approach would not to give relaxation on individual cases but to amend the act or rule or the guidelines in case of real hardship so that the benefit accrues to all and not to a few individuals who approach for such relaxation” whereas in the present case the Government has not followed the same while issuing the impugned GO and requested to withdraw the same G.O. in light of the policy adopted by the Government of A.P.
- Further, that (D. Ramesh Babu Vs Principle Secretary to Govt. MA & UD Dept. Hyderabad ALD 65) in light of the Article 309 of Constitution of India, “the executive Governments under a constitution order are not conferred powers for the personal gratification of successive state acts who occupy the Executive Offices. The Constitutional and legal grant of power is coupled with an obligation to act in harmony with the constitutional mandate of equality and with virtue to subverse the public interest not accordance to the individual whim. Public power is not always a prerogative power, the power of relaxation is a species of public power to be exercised in public interest, rationally, equitably and on legitimate classification parameters it cannot be discriminately applied by irrelevant or shady choice or identification of persons for grant of the benefit of relaxation”.
- Further it is respectfully submit that, the employees who have scrupulously passed the departmental test within three years from the date of joining and who failed to do so not constitute the same class or group as they have to be necessarily belong to different from the above since the persons who passed the tests earned their right for declaration of probation as per rules while those who failed to do so constitute entirely different class or group since their probation can never be declared within the stipulated except by relaxing the rules . In this case it is not a right earned by them but on gratis being un-equals in the eye of law they cannot be treated equally by applying the Rule 31

and relaxing the rule. The individuals would gain an undue and unfair advantage of Seniority over their colleagues who joined the service along with them and successfully passed the tests within the stipulated time without taking the benefit of extension of probation.

- While upheld the power to relax rules, the Supreme Court Categorically directed that the Government must be satisfied the existence of under hardship or public interest (Amarik Sing Vs UOI AIR 1980 SC1477 and R.R.Verna Vs UOI AIR 1980 SC 1461) the power to the Government is only to do justice is an exceptional case when by the application of particular rules cause grave injustice to a particular personal the same power can be exercised in any particular case to reduce the hardship and not generally. If the competent authority chooses to relax the rule in this case it amount to a gross abuse of the power of relaxation which amounts to an act violation of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution.
- In light of the above submission, the impugned G.O. issued on the unreasonable grounds shall not satisfy either the public interest or undue hardship by applying the rules and liable to withdraw accordingly.

(2) Revision of Settled Seniority / Panels is Gross Violation of Guidelines and Rules:

- In the circular Memo Number 57759/SER-A/2004-1 dt. 20-05-2014 the Government of Andhra Pradesh directed that not to re-open the settled seniority (Review / Revision) for a period which is more than 3 years, whereas in the present case the seniority has been settled by the competent authority by following the procedure prescribed in the Rule 6 and other provisions of APSSS Rules. Hence the proposed revision of seniority is contrary to the provisions of APSSS Rules and the guidelines issued from time to time and liable to withdraw the proposals accordingly.
- Further, it is pertinent to note that if any grievance regarding the confirmation and declaration of probation and the placement in the seniority of panels, the individual who has any grievance they have to appeal before the competent authority within Six (6) months from the date of order (Rule-23) and the appellate authority has to decide the same matter within one year. Further, no appeal for restoration of seniority of assignment of notional seniority on par with this juniors shall not be entertained by the appellate authority after a period of 90 days from the date on which junior was

promoted (Rule 26(d)). Whereas in the present case the impugned seniority was finalized by competent authority in the reference 1st cited. Thereby, at this juncture, the revision of seniority is against the provisions of APSSS Rules and guidelines as stated supra and liable to withdraw accordingly.

(3) The order of preference in the given panels not followed the order of merit as prescribed Under Rules 6, 33(b), 36(1):

- The earlier seniority order dt. 03.10.2012 not followed the basic principles as laid down in the APSSS Rules while preparing the panels U/R 6, the same may be rectified and the seniority may kindly be prepared afresh by duly following APSSS Rules 1996 to avoid un-necessary litigation in this matter.
- According to the Rule 6 and Rule 33(b) ,36(1) of APSSS Rules 1996 the seniority of the D.R's shall be w.r.t. their merit ranking as assigned by the APPSC and not in accordance with the roster points communicated by the APPSC U/R 22(e) of APSSS Rules. In this aspect the observation of the Hon'ble Judiciary bodies are hereby extracted for the ready reference as under:

“Higher in merit cannot be lowered in seniority”
(SC in CA No. 4435/2008 dt. 16-07-2008)

“The seniority in the cadre should be fixed on the basis of ranking assigned by the selecting authority and not as per the Roster Points”

1. M. Nagaraju Vs UOI reported in the J.T. 2006(9) SC-9
2. Bhimlesh Tanwar Vs State of Harayana & Others.

- The preparation of seniority list of DR's strictly on the basis of the state wide selection (RTOs) and state wide seniority as per the notification and also as per the provisions of Rule 33(b) of APSSS Rules and not in accordance with the roster points communicated.

(APAT in O.A.No.11030/2008 and batch on dt. 23-07-2009).

- Further, it is humbly bring to kind notice of the respectable Commissioner of Commercial Taxes that the previous revision of seniorities were finalized without proper intimation and not given reasonable opportunity to submit the objections against such show cause notice which was

kept only in the common portal and not served in person on the effected persons either through official mail-ids or through circle offices which is against the principles of natural justice and the procedure prescribed under the APSSS Rules 1996.

- In this aspect it is also respectfully submit that mere non submission of objections against the proposals made in the show cause notice, by improper application of the law, issued before passing finalization of seniority proceedings cannot be legalized and the legitimate rights of the individuals, as enshrined under APSSS Rule, cannot be denied in light of the procedural aspects. In light of the above submission, requested to prepare the merit panels as envisaged U/R 33(b), 36(1) of APPSS Rules and do justice accordingly.

(4) Brought Forward vacancies not shown in the top of the panel:

- In the recently finalized integrated seniority of the DCTO's for the Panel Year 2004-05 vide Gazette No. 20 dt.18-04-2017 published in Part-2 in AP Extraordinary Gazette the respectable Commissioner of Commercial Taxes has took a stand on the order of preference pertaining to the B.F. Vacancies and replied in Point No.3 that, "if the vacancies are available in a particular panel year then the vacancies are C/F to the next panel year. The B/F vacancies are place in the top of the panel year. Further only qualified persons are placed in the panel year". Accordingly irrespective of the date of joining in the cadre/service the respectable CCT considered the date of arising of vacancies is the criterion for the fixation of the seniority for the B.F. Vacancies.
- On the same lines the kind Commissioner of Commercial Taxes may kind consider that the total B.F. Vacancies related to the DR's have to be placed in the top of the panel year 2000-01 and all the D.R's have to be placed against such B.F. Vacancies as followed in the Gazette No. 20.

(5) Correction of Panel Year Assignment

- In the given Revised Show Cause Notice, the Panel Year Noted against the each candidate was wrongly noted instead of their actual panel year. These typographical mistakes may be rectified in the final proceedings accordingly.

Reply :

- Their contention that as no public interest is involved thereby issuance of G.O.Rt.No. 5, dt. 01.01.2019 by the Government is not reasonable and not correct. Rule 31 of AP. State and Subordinate Service rules,

1996 (in short APSSS Rules), empowered the Government to issue relaxation orders. This proviso starting with non obstante clause also empowers the Government to issue relaxation for any APSSS Rules or Special Rules without reference to the other existing provisions of APSSS Rules and Special Rules in favour of any person or class of persons not only in the case of public interest but relaxation can be also given to the rules which are likely to cause undue hardship to the person or class of persons concerned. This G.O. was issued to maintain parity among the 2001 batch ACTOs and also that their failure to get pass the departmental tests in time, mostly due to not conducting departmental tests in time and health grounds. All these ACTOs are appointed in February 2001 but for not timely conducting departmental tests in time they lost the opportunity of passing the departmental tests in time, the other reasons reflecting the G.O. are only supporting in nature but not the main reason of non conduction of departmental test in time. Further Government having satisfied and to reduce the undue hardship, issued these orders of relaxations. Further questioning the consequential present action of revision is not correct and not warranted.

- Their contention that of not reopening the seniority after 3 years with reference to Government Circular Memo No. 57759/Ser. A/2004-1, dt. 20.05.2004 is also will not come to their rescue as this exercise of revision is warranted only due to relaxation of Rule 16 (h) of APSSS Rules by the Government in respect of DR ACTOs of Visakhapatnam Nodal Division and this is not either a suo moto revision or a revision on application. This circular memo relied upon by them is meant to curb the revisions taken up in the cases where the individuals having accepted the seniority and making request after 3 years without making an appeal or sought revision in time.
- Further their plea to relocate or revise the seniority as per merit list now made at this point of time is also hit by latches as they have not raised any objections before finalization of seniority that was finalized on 11.09.2008 or they have not preferred an appeal or not sought review over the finalized seniority dt. 11.09.2008. Further, also the Commissioner (CT), combined state of Andhra Pradesh while finalization of the seniority list of ACTOs in respect of Visakhapatnam Nodal Division in pursuant of Government instructions and as well as Hon'ble APAT orders, before finalization, issued a show cause notice to all the affected ACTOs including to the above individuals and it was finalized on 03.10.2012. The

individuals have not filed any objections or preferred any appeal against the seniority list dt. 03.10.2012. Further due to above said reasons their request at present for placing them in the top of panel against brought forward vacancies now at this point of time is also hit by latches. Further the question of showing the brought forward vacancies in respect of DCTOs cannot be equated with ACTOs.

- Typographical mistakes rectified.

II. Objections filed by Sri V. Appala Naidu, DCTO, O/o CTO, Dwarakanagar Circle:

- He joined as ACTO on 07.02.2001. Basing on the relaxation orders issued by the Government vide G.O.Rt.No.5, dt. 01.01.2019 his probation was declared on 06.02.2003. Hence, his name should be in 2000-01 panel year. He requested to fix his seniority in 2000-01 panel year.

Reply :

- For direct recruits, mentioning the panel year is not necessary. However, he placed in the panel year 2000-01.

III. Objections filed by Sri M. Srinivasa Rao, DCTO, O/o CTO, Dwarakanagar Circle:

- In the Show Cause Notice dt. 29.03.2019 it is mentioned that he was selected Group -I in the remarks column. Actually he did not select for Group -I service. In fact Sri P.Srirama Murthy which was mentioned above his name was selected Group - I service. Further Smt G. Uma Parameswari which is mentioned below his name also selected for Group -I service. He is now discharging his duties in Commercial Tax Department. Further panel year also not mentioned against his name. He requested to rectify the same.

Reply :

- The typographical mistake is now rectified by deleting the same in the remarks column as he was not selected to Group -I Services.
- For direct recruits, mentioning the panel year is not necessary. However, he placed in the panel year 2000-01.
- As per seniority list dt. 03.10.2012 Sri P. Sri Rama Murthy and Smt G.Uma Parameswari are selected Group -I. But in the present Show Cause Notice the same is missing and now the same is rectified by mentioning that Sri P.Sri Rama Murthy and Smt G.Uma Parameswari are selected Group -I.

IV. Objections filed by Smt R. Suvarna, ACTO, O/o CTO, Anakapalli :

- The Additional Commissioner (CT) finalized the seniority list of ACTOs for the year 2000-01 to 2004-05, where in her name was placed at Sl.No. 8 unfortunately the panel year was not mentioned / indicated to her and also for the Sl.Nos. 3 to 7 and Sl.Nos. 9 to 10.
- Incidentally, she also submit that in the proposed Revised Seniority list in Annexure enclosed to the Show Cause Notice, her name was shown at Sl.No. 8 of the seniority list dt. 03.10.2012 and Sl.No. 12 in the proposed Show Cause notice without mentioning the panel year.
- She stated that since she was selected in the year 10/1999 notification and joined the Department on 03.02.2001 against the BC- B (W) with the rank of 49 of A.P. Public Service Commission and hence her name has to be included in the panel year of 2000-01.
- She requested that her name may be included in the panel year of 2000-01.

Reply :

- For direct recruits, mentioning the panel year is not necessary. However, she placed in the panel year 2000-01.

V. Objections filed by Sri U. Keswara Rao, DCTO, O/o CTO, Rajam Circle :

- He appeared for Group - II services in pursuant to notification No. 10/1999 and he secured 388.757 marks with hall ticket No. 10000138 and stood first rank among the SC candidates in Zone-I i.e. his native Zone.
- He submit that recently in the wake of result issued by APPSC, Hyderabad dt. 10.07.2018 for 10/1999 Group -II and he was put in the list of Register numbers of 1st spell Executive posts selected candidates who are not disturbed and as per APPSC letter Dt:19.04.2007, the roster point which was accorded by APPSC to him is 52/100 in Zone -I.
- He further submitted that he asked the APPSC about his roster point under Tag. No. 4189 dt, 15.05.2018, then the APPSC in their reply shown that the roster point awarded was also 52/100 in Zone -I.

- Further submit that, in the due course the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes also requested the APPSC to provide the first spell of candidates of ACTOs with their Roster points and accordingly the APPSC submitted the list to the Commissioner of Commercial taxes vide reference cited. In that list also he was put at 52/100 in Zone -I.
- But in the Show Cause Notice communicated in the reference cited in page No. 2 against Sl.No. 13, roster point No. 52 (SC) and in page no.4 Sl.No. 22 and in Annexure dt. 29.03.2019 attached to the Show Cause Notice in Sl.no. 22 (Serial Number in the proposed seniarty list No. 15) Sri P. Venugopal Rao has been placed instead of his name as per the communications issued by the APPSC vide references cited.
- Further he submit that as per the orders issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil appeal No. 5099 of 2006 and Revised provisional selection results of Group - II Service under Notification 10/99 by the APPSC, dt. 10.05.2018, he may be placed at roster point No. 52/100, which was originally allotted by the APPSC, in the inter - se- seniority list of ACTOs for the panel year 2000-01 for which he is legitimately eligible and also fix his seniority from 2001.
- Therefore, he request the benevolent Chief Commissioner (ST), A.P., Vijayawada may kindly his name in the roster point No. 52/100 in the seniority list in the place of Sri P.Venugopal Rao as per the objections stated supra and order issued by the authorities concerned.

Reply :

- His request for inclusion in the place of Sri P.Venugopal Rao is pending examination before the Government. After receipt of the Government orders action will be taken.
8. In view of the above, the objections made by the above individuals have not been considered and rejected. The revised seniority list of ACTOs of Visakhapatnam Nodal Division is confirmed and annexed here with as proposed in the reference 7th cited.
9. The revised seniority list of ACTOs of Visakhapatnam Nodal Division is subject to outcome of S.L.Ps /W.Ps/O.As/ appeals pending if any, before the Supreme Court of India, High Court of A.P/A.P.A.T/ Government.

ANNEXURE

Revised seniority list of ACTOs of Visakhapatnam Nodal Division
Revised seniority list of ACTOs of Zone-I

Sl.No in the seniority list	Name of the Individual	DOB	Panel Year	Remarks
1	P.V.R.Prasada Rao	01.07.1946	2000-01	Retired
2	T.Narayana Murthy	15.11.1943	2000-01	Retired
3	P.Kamala Rao	23.06.1962	2000-01	
4	P.Srirama Murthy	05.01.1970		Selected Group -I
5	M.Srinivasa Rao	07.01.1972		
6	D.Rambabu	25.09.1972		
7	V.Appala Naidu	01.01.1972		
8	G.Umaparameswari	28.06.1976		Selected Group -I
9	B.Sakuntala	15.06.1975		
10	P.Narayana Sastry	03.03.1971		
11	S.Tharaka Rama Rao	25.07.1972		
12	R.Suvarna	25.01.1971		
13	V.Gaja Lakshmi	08.01.1976		
14	U.Srinivasulu	06.06.1978		
15	P.Venu Gopal Rao	06.06.1971		
16	Ramesh Chandra Bariko	18.02.1961	2000-01	
17	Ch.Venkataramana	01.07.1958	2001-02	
18	J.Seetharamaswamy	15.06.1944	2001-02	Retired
19	K.Appa Rao	01.07.1953	2001-02	Retired
20	M.Ananda Rao	01.07.1946	2001-02	Retired
21	G.Taraprasad	04.09.1949	2001-02	Retired
22	Ch.Satyavathi	10.07.1946	2001-02	Retired
23	G.Nethaji	15.05.1958	2001-02	
24	I.Maruthi Rao	01.07.1958	2002-03	

Sl.No in the seniority list	Name of the Individual	DOB	Panel Year	Remarks
25	Y.Gurayya	06.03.1948	2002-03	Retired
26	D.Veerusu	07.01.1953	2002-03	Retired
27	A.Gopalam	15.12.1948	2003-04	Retired
28	G.Sathyavathi	08.03.1952	2003-04	Retired
29	V.V.Eswar Kumar	26.02.1950	2003-04	Retired
30	S.Ravi	16.01.1956	2003-04	
31	K.Balasubrahmanyam	20.11.1953	2003-04	Retired
32	I.Krishna Prasad	13.05.1950	2003-04	Retired
33	P.Ramalingam	15.07.1950	2003-04	Retired
34	M.Janardhana Rao	15.08.1952	2003-04	Retired
35	K.V.Suryanarayana	16.02.1952	2003-04	Retired
36	P.Ananda Rao	15.08.1957	2003-04	
37	A.Venkateswara Rao	14.10.1945	2003-04	Retired
38	Ch.Ananda Rao	15.06.1946	2004-05	Retired
39	G.Rajeshwari	15.06.1953	2004-05	Retired
40	G.Rama Krishna Rao	07.01.1949	2004-05	Retired
41	P.Ch.Rambabu	26.04.1962	2004-05	

T.K. RAMAMANI,
Chief Commissioner (ST). FAC.

---X---